

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT Address to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Docket No.	HANO-004
	Application No.	10/521,989
	Confirmation No.	1940
	Filing Date	November 3, 2005
	Examiner	Palenik, Jeffrey T
	Group Art Unit	1615

Sir:

This communication is submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement dated November 13, 2007. *A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time is submitted herewith, making this amendment due on or before January 14, 2008 (January 13, 2008 being a Sunday).* Accordingly, this Response is timely filed.

The Examiner therein required election of one of the following groups of claims:

Group I: Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 17-19, 21 and 22, drawn to a monoglyceride and oil based mucoadhesive composition;

Group II: Claims 23-25, drawn to a method of preparing the composition of Group I in the presence of an emulsifier;

Group III: Claims 26-31, 35, 36, 41-44, 46-50, drawn to a mucoadhesive composition comprising a monoglyceride, an oil and an insoluble drug;

Group IV: Claims 51-52, drawn to a method of preparing the formulation of Group III;

Group V: Claims 53-56, drawn to a method of preparing the formulation of Group III (drug solubilized before addition of emulsifier); or

Group VI: Claims 57 and 58, drawn to a method of preparing the formulation of Group III (emulsifier solubilized before addition of drug).

The Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the claims of **Group III**, Claims 26-31, 35, 36, 41-44, and 46-50, with traverse. As stated in the MPEP §803, if search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine the entire application on the merits, even though the entire application includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. It is the Applicants' position that it would not be unduly burdensome to perform a search on all of the claims together in the present application. Accordingly, the Applicants traverse the restriction requirement.